<u>REMARKS</u>

In the Office Action dated May 20, 2005, claims 1-18, 20, 22 and 25-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushita et al. in view of Storch et al. and French et al. Claims 19, 21, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the above combination, further in view of Phillips.

Applicants note with appreciation the interview courteously afforded the undersigned counsel for the Applicants on July 13, 2005, wherein the above amendments were proposed, and the manner by which the claims are patentable over the teachings of the above-cited references was discussed. Although a commitment to allowance was not made at the interview, the Examiner stated that upon the submission of a written response, the Amendment would be entered and the Examiner would recommend allowance to her Supervisor, subject to the approval of her Supervisor and conducting a closeout search.

As discussed at the interview the Matsushita et al. reference operates by adding a reference number, that represents a consumable item in a device, each time that consumable item is depleted and replaced. As explained in detail in Applicants' previous response filed January 3, 2005, this results in the RAM 204 in the Matsushita et al. reference accumulating a running total of each item as it has been consumed and replaced. Each time a replacement of the item occurs, its identification number is *added* to the contents of the RAM 204. The next time a replacement of that item is to occur, the identification number for the replacement item that is intended to be used is compared against the accumulated list in the RAM 204. As long as not match occurs, the new replacement item is then permitted to be used.

There is thus no "striking" of the identification number in the Matsushita et al. reference, it is merely transferred to the RAM 204 when the item that it identifies is consumed and replaced. The identification number therefore still exists in the Matsushita et al. device.

In the May 20, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner relied on the French reference as teaching the "striking" of a code word. The Examiner stated that the French reference teaches a system and method in which a code may be combined in a desired manner as long as the data center has the same combination information available to it, and the Examiner stated the reference code may be considered "struck" in the French reference, because the code may or may not be used again, since the system has the capability of combining the code in any desired manner.

In the independent claims of the present application, the word "striking" in the phrase "by striking the reference code from the device" was used in accordance with its normal dictionary meaning, as exemplified by the excerpt from Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary attached hereto. Definition 4 states "to delete something" and definition 18:2b states "to dismantle and take away." Applicants' position is that the French reference, by teaching that the code can *combined* in any desired manner, clearly contemplates that there will still be a *result* of the combination that persists or remains in the system and that if the result of any combination of the code in the French reference were a deletion or dismantling of the code, this would destroy the intended operation of the French system.

As discussed at the interview, it makes sense in the French reference to modify or change the code word in question, because the French reference is

directed to an encryption procedure, wherein it is desirable that a currently used code word not be easily derivable from a previously used code word. Applying this concept to the Matsushita et al. reference, however, would destroy its intended operation. This is because, as noted above, it is essential in the Matsushita et al. reference that the identification number for a new replacement item be able to be compared against the accumulated list in the RAM 204. If the identification numbers in the RAM 204 were modified or changed in accordance with the teachings of French before they were stored in the RAM 204, this would prevent making a comparison of any of those stored identification numbers with the identification number of the new replacement item. It is therefore essential that the identification numbers in the Matsushita et al. reference be stored *unchanged* in the RAM 204, in order to make the subsequent comparison with the identification number of a new replacement item possible.

Therefore, as discussed at the interview, modification of the Matsushita et al. reference in accordance with the teachings of French would preclude the Matsushita et al. system from operating as intended, and therefore it is not a permissible basis for justifying a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the additional reliance on the Storch reference, as a third reference need not be discussed in detail.

In the May 20, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner cited *In re McLaughlin*, and *In re Bozek* for the proposition that the test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art, and the proposition that references are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. Applicants of course do not disagree with these general statements, however, the underlying assumption

behind those statements is that somewhere, outside of Applicants' disclosure, there will be identifiable evidence of motivation or inducement.

The Federal Circuit stated in *In re Lee* 227 F.3d 1338, 61 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002):

"The factual inquiry whether to combine references must be thorough and searching. ...It must be based on objective evidence of record. This precedent has been reinforced in myriad decisions, and cannot be dispensed with."

Similarly, quoting *C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Systems, Inc.* 157 F.3d 1340, 1352, 48 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1225, 1232 (Fed. Cir. 1998), the Federal Circuit in *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Court v. Philip Morris, Inc.,* 229 F.3d 1120, 1124-1125, 56 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1456, 1459 (Fed. Cir. 2000) stated:

[A] showing of a suggestion, teaching or motivation to combine the prior art references is an 'essential component of an obviousness holding'.

In *In re Dembiczak,* 175 F.3d 994,999, 50 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999) the Federal Circuit stated:

Our case law makes clear that the best defense against the subtle but powerful attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis is rigorous application of the requirement for a showing of the teaching or motivation to combine prior art references.

Consistently, in *In re Rouffet,* 149 F.3d 1350, 1359, 47 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1453, 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1998), the Federal Circuit stated:

[E]ven when the level of skill in the art is high, the Board must identify specifically the principle, known to one of ordinary skill in the art, that suggests the claimed combination. In other words, the Board must explain the reasons one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the references and to combine them to render the claimed invention obvious.

In Winner International Royalty Corp. v. Wang, 200 F.3d 1340, 1348-1349, 53 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1580, 1586 (Fed. Cir. 2000), the Federal Circuit stated:

Although a reference need not expressly teach that the disclosure contained therein should be combined with another, ... the showing of combinability, in whatever form, must nevertheless be clear and particular.

Lastly, in *Crown Operations International, Ltd. v. Solutia, Inc.,* 289 F.3d 1367, 1376, 62 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1917 (Fed. Cir. 2002), the Federal Circuit stated:

There must be a teaching or suggestion within the prior art, within the nature of the problem to be solved, or within the general knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention, to look to particular sources, to select particular elements, and to combine them as combined by the inventor.

As noted above, the Examiner acknowledged that the Matsushita reference discloses the use of code numbers to prevent unauthorized use, but does not specifically disclose "striking" a number once it is used, but the Examiner relied on the French reference as using a wide combination of code numbers that may be changed over time, or even randomized, for increased security. Applicants respectfully submit that in order to use these statements as a basis for substantiating a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) the Examiner must first demonstrate why a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field would consider the combining of code numbers to be "striking" a code number and must then present evidence as to why such a person of ordinary skill would be motivated or induced to modify the Matsushita reference to "strike" reference code numbers (as opposed to "combining" reference code numbers). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to provide the rigorous evidentiary substantiation for reaching such a conclusion, as required by the above-cited decisions.

In view of all of the above, it was agreed at the interview that prosecution would be advanced by at all locations in the independent claims substituting

"permanently deleting" for "striking." The phrase "permanently deleting" is consistent with, and a part of, the attached dictionary definitions for "striking," and therefore it does not raise a new issue requiring further searching or consideration, but clarifies Applicants' original intent with regard to the independent claims to the satisfaction of the Examiner.

In view of the agreements reached at the interview, all claims of the application are submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early consideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by

(Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP CUSTOMER NO. 26574

Patent Department 6600 Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive Chicago, Illinois 60606 Telephone: 312/258-5790

Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 4301089.1

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



WEBSTER'S
Ninth New
Collegiate
Dictionary



A GENUINE MERRIAM-WEBSTER

The name Webster alone is no guarantee of excellence. It is used by a number of publishers and may serve mainly to mislead an unwary buyer.

A Merriam-Webster® is the registered trademark you should look for when you consider the purchase of dictionaries or other fine reference books. It carries the reputation of a company that has been publishing since 1831 and is your assurance of quality and authority.

Copyright © 1987 by Merriam-Webster Inc.

Philippines Copyright 1987 by Merriam-Webster Inc.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data Main entry under title:

Webster's ninth new collegiate dictionary.

Based on Webster's third new international dictionary.

Includes index.

1. English language—Dictionaries. I. Merriam-Webster Inc.
PE1628.W5638 1987 423 86-23801
ISBN 0-87779-508-8
ISBN 0-87779-509-6 (indexed)
ISBN 0-87779-510-X (deluxe)

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary principal copyright 1983

COLLEGIATE trademark Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

All rights reserved. No part of this book covered by the copyrights hereon may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means—graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, taping, or information storage and retrieval systems—without written permission of the publisher.

Made in the United States of America

2526RMc N87

Ab

a; either of the straight sides of a racecourse; esp: HOMESTRETCH b: a final stage 8: the capacity for being stretched: ELASTICITY stretch adj (1954): easily stretched: ELASTIC(a ~ wig) stretcher (stretch-er (s stone and with its length parallel to the face of the wall b; a timber of rod used esp. when horizontal as a tie in framed work 3: a litter (as of canvas) for carrying a disabled or dead person 4: a rod or bar extending between two legs of a chair or table stretcher-bearer, hor-\n (ca. 1876): one who carries one end of a stretcher

end of a stretcher
stretch—out \'strech-aut\ n (1930) 1: a system of industrial operation
in which workers are required to do extra work and esp. to operate
more machines than formerly either with slight or with no additional
pay 2 a: the act of stretching out: the state of being stretched out
b: an economizing measure that spreads a limited quantity over a
larger field than orig. intended
stretch receptor n (ca. 1956): MUSCLE SPINDLE
stretch runner n (1922): a racchorse that makes a strong bid in the
homestretch

nomestretch stretch (a) also stretta (a) n pl stretti (a) or strettos stretto fr. It, fr. stretto nerrow, close, fr. L strictus, pp.; stretta fr. It, fr. lem. of stretto — more at strict] (1854) 1 a: the overlapping of answer with subject in a musical fugue b: the part of a fugue characterized by this overlapping 2: a concluding passage performed in a duicker tempo.

terized by this overlapping 2: a concluding passage performed in a quicker tempostreused (striu-sal), zol, s(h)troi-\n [G, lit., something strewn; fr. MHG (strousel, fr. strouwen to strew, fr. OHG strewen] (1926): a crumbly mixture of fat, sugar, and flour and sometimes nuts and spices that is used as topping or filling for cake strew (striu), vs. strewed; strewed or strewn (b) of strewen (b) strewen, strowen, fr. OE strewed, strewdon; akin to OHG strewen (of strew, L struere to heap up, sternere to spread out, Gk stornynal) (bef. 12c) 1: to spread by scattering 2: to cover by or as if by scattering something (~ing the highways with litter). 3: to become dispersed over as if scattered 4: to spread abroad: (1602): something (as flowers) strewed or designed for strewing stria (stri-a), n. pl. striae (stri-c) [L. furrow, channe — more at STRIKE] (1563) 1: STRIATION 2. 2: a stripe or line (as in the skin) distinguished from surrounding tissue by color, texture, or elevation (the striae of pregnancy resulting from stretching and rupture of elastic fibers).

thbers). | Stri-ate \stri-ot, -,åt\ adj (1670) : STRIATED | Stri-ate \-,āt\ vi stri-at-ed; stri-at-ing (1709) : to mark with striations or

striate (1861) and (1864) 1: marked with striations or striae 2: of, relating to, or being striated muscle striated muscle is muscle striated muscle is muscle striated muscle is muscle issue that is marked by transverse dark and light bands, that is made up of elongated multinuclear fibers, and that is found in the muscles under voluntary control clothing the vertebrate skeleton and in all or most of the musculature of arthropods compare SMOOTH MUSCLE

— compare SMOOTH MUSCLE

stria-stion, Stri-a-shon\ n (ca.: 1847) = 1 a : the fact for state of being

stria-stion, Stri-a-shon\ n (ca.: 1847) = 1 a : the fact for state of being

striated b: arrangement of striations or striae: 2: a minute groove,

scratch, or channel esp, when one of a parallel series: 3: any of the

alternate dark and light cross bands of a myofibril of striated muscle

strick \strik\ n [ME stric, strik, prob. of LG or D origin; akin to MLG

strik row, MD stric [15c]: a bunch of hackled flax, jute, or hemp

strick-en \strik-an\adj [fr. pp. of strike] (15c) 1: hit or wounded by

or as if by a missile 2 a: afflicted or overwhelmed by or as if by

disease, misfortune; or sorrow b: made incapable or unfit: INCAPACI
TATED

TATED strick-al\'n [ME strikel]; akin to OE strican to stroke — more at STRIKE] (15c): a foundry tool for smoothing the surface of a core or mold — strickle with the strickle

at STRIKE] (150): a foundry tool for smoothing the surface of a core or mold—strickle with strict \strict\strict\\strict\\strict\\strict\\strict\strict\strict\\strict\strict\strict\strict\\strict\strict\strict\\strict\strict\strict\strict\\strict\strict\strict\strict\strict\\strict\strict\strict\\strict\strict\strict\strict\strict\strict\strict\\strict\stri

rescence) syn see RIGID — strict.ly.\strik-(t) = adv — strictness \strik(t)-nos\n n \text{ strik(t)-nos\n} n \text{ strictura, fr. L striket.nos\n n \text{ striket} n \text{ striket.nos\n} n \text{ striket.nos\n

strictch * strike out 1167

stridor \strid-or, \stri_do(a)r\ n [L; fr. stridere, stridere] (1632) 1: a harsh shrill, or creaking noise 2: a harsh vibrating sound heard during expiration in cases of obstruction of the air passages state-the text of the stridere of the stridere stridered (uring expiration) in cases of obstruction of the air passages state-the text of the stridered of the stridere

worker strike-breaking \kin\ n (1919): action designed to break up a strike strike off w (1821) 1: to produce in an effortless manner. 2: to depict clearly and exactly strike-out.\strike-aut\ n (1887): an out in baseball resulting from a batter's being charged with three strikes strike out.\(\frac{1}{2}\) strike-out.\(\frac{1}{2}\) strike out.\(\frac{1}{2}\) on a course of action 2: to set out vigorously 3: to make an out in baseball by a strikeout.

\a\abut \a\kitten, F table \ar\further \a\ash \a\ ace \a\cot, cart \au\out: \ch\chin \e\ bet \e\easy \g\ go \i\ hit \i\ ice \j\ job \n)\sing \0\go \0\law \0i\boy \th\thin \th\the \u\\1001 \